

Questions & Answers
Daehlin's Union 76
703 21st St, Monroe WI
53566-2850-03
03-23-002587

Is any drum containing soil cuttings/free product/contaminated water stored on the site and needs to be disposed of?

There are 14 barrels of investigative waste/contaminated groundwater on site that require disposal.

Based on the 10/97 report, 5th tank (formerly used to store premium unleaded gasoline) is out of service. Where is that tank located? Will the tank be remove?

All known UST's have been removed. See Figure 2 in the 10/97 Remedial Investigation Report for the former location of the fifth UST.

What is the name of the bank for PECFA loan?

The claimant was reimbursed finance costs invoiced from Firststar Bank Wisconsin however, the Commerce has no information indicating that the claimant will continue utilizing Firststar Bank Wisconsin.

Should the consultant be approved by the bank to participate in the bidding process and get the job after being successful?

There is no Commerce requirement that consultants must be approved by a bank to participate in the bid process.

An existing consultant is an unsuccessful bidder due to non-compliance of the bid. The owner wants to retain the existing consultant in spite of non-compliance of the bid. Will the department encourage to hire non-compliant bidders (previous consultants)?

Commerce prefers that the responsible party hire the consulting firm that submitted the winning bid. However, Commerce does not encourage or discourage claimants from hiring a particular consultant.

An existing consultant is an unsuccessful bidder due to higher cost as compared to the cost of successful bidder. The owner wants to retain the existing consultant. Will the department promote this process?

Commerce prefers that the responsible party hire the consulting firm that submitted the winning bid. However, at this time, the claimant can determine what PECFA-eligible consulting firm they will hire for the activities.

Will it be possible for the department to send a copy of the tabulated results at the same when the letter is sent to the successful bidder ?

The tabulated bid results will be posted on the internet shortly after the claimant is notified of the results.

Regarding source area removal, the minimum requirements call for removing contaminated soils in the area of b-5 through b-8 to a depth of 15 to 20 feet, "as necessary". What does "as necessary" mean?

The words "as necessary" in this sentence refer to the backfill. The purpose of the words is to emphasize that sufficient backfill must be used to fill the excavation to match the surrounding grade. The excavation depth range of "15-20 feet" is intended to allow for contaminant distribution and must be determined by field screening.

B-7 appears to be close to, or beneath the edge of the canopy, and B-8 is right next to a support pillar for the canopy. Any chance PECFA would make an exception and pay to remove and replace the canopy? The worst of the contaminated soil is probably beneath the pump island. None of that can be safely dug with the canopy in place.

Per Comm 47.30(1)(g), costs associated with supporting or protecting existing structures within the remediation area are eligible for PECFA reimbursement. Reimbursement for re-installation of structures without prior Comm approval may not be made. Because this public bid process is for investigation and interim remedial action services and not remedial actions through closure, Comm will not approve re-installation of the structure.

Access to the proposed locations for MW-10, 15, 16 and 17 will be required. Is the bidder responsible for negotiating agreements and permission for access to these private properties?

Bidder is responsible for negotiating property access, however the Department of Natural Resources will assist consistent with past practices.

Assuming the bidder is responsible for obtaining access, has access to any of the areas you are requiring new wells been denied in the past? I couldn't help noticing a huge void with respect to monitoring data from the block immediately south of the daehlin property (area of proposed MW-15). Given that the property to the south is an operating gas station, it is understandable that they would deny access for a monitoring well.

Access to the property directly south has neither been requested nor denied. A separate WDNR file containing environmental data exists for this property. In the past, property access was denied at the former Monroe Railroad Depot, currently the Cheese Museum.

For the soil removal from areas B-5 through B-8. Is the UST system shown on the figures still in use. If yes, is the system going to be closed before soil removal. It appears that the piping would be ripped out? How much soil does WDCOM estimate needs to be removed?

There is no UST system in use at the site. All known UST's have been removed.